

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 were presented for examination and were rejected. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration in light of the amendments and the following comments.

The claims as originally filed used the "said" convention for introducing previously-introduced limitations. The claims have been amended to switch to the "the" convention because it is more easily read and comprehended. No substantive change in the scope of the claims is desired or intended by this change.

Claims 1 and 19 have been amended to clearly distinguish the present invention from the prior art cited by the Office. In particular, the claims have been amended to recite that the delivery of presence status to the recipient is contingent on the recipient having the proper permission. The subject matter of this amendment is taught in paragraph [0031] of the Specification. The applicants respectfully submit that the amendment to claims 1 and 19 overcomes their rejection.

Claim 14 has been amended to better define the invention. The subject matter of the amendment is taught in paragraph [0042] of the Specification. The applicants respectfully submit that the amendment to claim 14 overcomes its rejection.

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejection of Claims 1-13 and 19-25

Claims 1-13 and 19-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by B. Appleman, World Application 03/098425 (hereinafter "Appleman"). The applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, overcome the rejection.

The applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable because the claims, as amended, are clearly distinguishable from Appleman

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. A method comprising:
receiving an email message from a sender;
obtaining a presence status of the sender from a presence server,
wherein the presence status indicates a presence status of the sender across
a plurality of domains;
delivering the email message to a recipient with an indication of a
presence of the sender on one or more of the domains; *and*
wherein the presence status is obtained if and only if the recipient has
a permission to receive the sender's presence status.
(Emphasis Supplied)

Nowhere does Appleman teach or suggest, alone or in combination with the other references, what the amended claim 1 recites — *namely, the obtaining of the presence status of the sender of an email by the email recipient only if the recipient has a permission to receive the presence status.*

Therefore, the applicants respectfully submit, that the rejection of claim 1 is overcome.

Because claims 2-13 depend on claim 1, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of them is also overcome.

Claim 19, as amended, recites:

19. (Currently Amended) An apparatus comprising:
a memory; and
at least one processor, coupled to the memory, operative to:
receive an email message from a sender;
obtain a presence status of the sender from a presence server,
wherein the presence status indicates a presence status of the sender across
a plurality of domains;
deliver the email message to a recipient with an indication of a
presence of the sender on one or more of the plurality of domains; *and*
wherein the presence status is obtained if and only if the recipient has
a permission to receive the sender's presence status.
(Emphasis Supplied)

For the same reasons as for claim 1, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 19 is overcome.

Because claims 20-25 depend on claim 19, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of them is also overcome.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejection of Claims 14-18

Claim 14-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over B. Appleman, World Application 03/098425 (hereinafter "Appleman"). in view of A. Milewski, U.S. Patent 6, 501, 834 (hereinafter "Milewski"). The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 14, as amended, recites:

14. A method comprising:
receiving an email message from a sender;
obtaining a presence status of the sender across a plurality of domains;
delivering the email message to a recipient with an indication of a presence of the sender on one or more of the domains and
automatically initiating a communication with a device at which the sender is believed to be present, wherein the initiated communication is not an email communication.
(Emphasis Supplied)

Neither Appleman nor Milewski teach or suggest, alone or in combination, what claim 14 recites — namely, *the automatic initiation of a communication with a device at which the sender is believed to be present, wherein the initiated communication is not an email communication.*

For these reasons, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 14 is overcome.

Because claims 15-18 depend on claim 14, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of them is also overcome.

Request for Reconsideration Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.111

Having responded to each and every ground for objection and rejection in the last Office action, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the instant application pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111 and request that the Examiner allow all of the pending claims and pass the application to issue.

If there are remaining issues, the applicants respectfully request that Examiner telephone the applicants' attorney so that those issues can be resolved as quickly as possible.

Respectfully,
Shabbir A. Khakoo et al.

By **/Kiril Dimov/**
Kiril Dimov
Reg. No. 60490
732-578-0103 x215

DeMont & Breyer, L.L.C.
Suite 250
100 Commons Way
Holmdel, NJ 07733
United States of America